~~3202 - Novel~~
~~3218 - Bertrand~~ on 42 "Mangold is impressively an encapsulation of Angleton's accomplishments in Italy, in records & leads obtained. The volume of these is insignificant compared with what the Army recovered in Germany. I doubt that X-2 caught over 1000 enemy intelligence agents." What Mangold does not report is how thoroughly OSS Italy was penetrated by the Nazis, who caught team after team dropped behind Nazi lines. So what were Angleton & X-2 really doing? accusing left-wing trade-union people? They sure as hell did not do a good job of protecting our own

An index check shows no mention of John L. Hart's Rosenko testimony although he has two chapters on Rosenko

At 60-1 I am wondering if Mangold tells how Rocca et al inhibited a Warren Commission. Check of index shows 3 pages referring to it: 173, 175, 193

73 reports nothing on defection and he had ties to Oswald. Nosenko was omitted ~~testimony~~ and as he does on 175 he says these Angleton people were frustrated Hoover's best efforts to ~~have~~ have the Commission ~~hear~~ hear Nosenko. That the FBI did more than merely provide a copy of its reports that I published is not proven & not even indicated in note 193 is only a mention of the division with CIA on Oswald - CI & SRD differing & CI "enmeshed" with Commission, "enmeshed" not the reality. Index held no mention of any of W C staff assigned to this area, as did Colonel Clarkson, or to Rankin, who might have left a record or been mentioned on it or that.

What appears is include all he says about Angleton with the figure without indicating whether there are indication of other such abuses - without a hint, without asking a question.

And, since he knows & France, with no indication of the visit to the CIA & to the country of the Angleton/Glitsgen sister-city

3) - To page 160, I am wondering about any real meaningful success Congleton & his C.P. really had and took. That, from what is known, any really significant intelligence success he did strike out. They both played cold war games in which many were hurt. But I think of no real accomplishments. All the "success" like government over Moros, did the U.S. no good at all and all wound up hurting us and costing us great amounts of money directly & indirectly. Like Guatemala, El Salvador. Aside etc. Disclosure of Phillipines to Property Congressional Inquiry of Affair may well have been leaked and in any event should this interest. But up to the chosen to part of this book, I managed learned of any real counter intelligence success he does not report them.

If the Rosenbo defection, in which CI can take no credit, is considered significant, then it is apparent that CI blew it - lost all the initial value it had and diminished what later was obtained from it.

Vernon "Pete" Bagley (Daley?) First in CIA to speak to Nosenko George Roselvalter sent from HQ

When Nosenko arrived the CIA in 1964 Bagley & Roselvalter were sent & Cortigan land the same day. Does this indicate that a) Bagley made up the invalid reasons to reject Nosenko and b) that Roselvalter was able to pinpoint Nosenko was taken to DC? (171) (211 172) Doesn't

JFK assassination / Nosenko begins on 174. As a reflection of Jeff Goldberg's knowledge of the activities, Mangold writes that the CIA + FBI knew both

5) "Urgently" working at why the assassination for the Warren Commission. Neither actually investigated the crime itself & from what is known the CIA's role was largely to answer requests, volunteer nothing & discourage interest in Oswald.

Ordinarily I would regard this omission of the first published account of these alleged FBI record - albeit not cited from the FBI's disclosed records - as par. because it is not uncommon for my work to be used and not credited. But in not citing Post Mortem they obscure the fact that they lie about what Oswald actually said, that the WCD did suspect that O actually was a "sleeper agent". So departure from normal practice in citing this underscores the lie & tends to indicate that the lie is not an accident. When what she is omitted from the cited records only there is a real question of honesty & motive.

As slowly I read more I cannot believe that ignorance or accident account for it. This leads to what can or does. What at this point I think cannot be ignored is that

it may be part of a deal perhaps involving access to Moscow & waiver of employee contracts that require silence except when talking is officially approved. While this may be entirely wrong and unfair, it is something that cannot be ignored, particularly absent any account of how they got access to Moscow. I've seen none.

181 - The CIA did disclose the so-called analysis of the JFK assassination by an unidentified defector, clearly fabrication. It is totally insane & I wonder why they do not use it. Can they be so ignorant of what is being disclosed?

I think Mangold has coined the title "Fundamentalists" to describe the Angleton gang instead of the suitable and accurate "conservatives" because he is a bit of a conservative.

Note to self - ~~198~~ 204, 401.2 (2) Bob Woodward
~~book Hunt~~ Casey, funds to us, output to CIA
"Fundamentalists"

6/ Mangold somehow avoids informing the Reader that a clear right-wing bias and agenda is more than merely visible in Angleton's actions & assertions. Can it be because Mangold's own political beliefs are not all that far from Angleton's?

Omissions in text and notes indicating ego-tripping, scholarly dishonesty, etc as in the Angleton concept that Harold Wilson was KGB. In neither the text nor his notes does he mention that this had come to light in Peter Wright's "Spy-catcher" or that there was an appalling book on it, "The Wilson Plot". This is also one of the indications that in this book Mangold has his own political agenda, axes to grind, dislikes to slant or pay more attention to

- p 335 Mangold has had no interpretation of the improprieties & illegalities in what Angleton did when they so clearly are what his title implies, of the Cold War. But in this really run amok

no ref to Mexico city safe